



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

<b>Applicant</b>	Castaic Lake Water Agency	<b>County</b>	Los Angeles
<b>Project Title</b>	Upper Santa Clara River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Round 2 Proposition 84 Planning Grant	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$735,000
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$980,000

**Project Description** The Proposal requests funding to (1) update the Agency's 2002 Recycled Water Master Plan (RWMP) and prepare the associated California Environmental Quality Act documentation and (2) update the 2008 Santa Clarita Valley Water Use Efficiency Strategic Plan (WUE Plan). Both of these documents will provide information vital to developing a cost-effective water supply portfolio for the Agency's service area and compliance with SBx7-7 regulations. In addition, the studies will help identify current and future recycled water demands, project future water conservation requirements, and identify new conservation management programs, meet new Standards, fill identified data gaps identified within the RWMP and WUE Plan, and meet the specific water quality objectives for the IRWMP.

### Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	15
DAC Involvement	6
Schedule	5
Budget	6
Program Preferences	5
Tie Breaker	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>37</b>

- **Work Plan** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Table 3.1 summarizes the status of the existing Plan and how it will meet the current IRWM Plan standards. It also describes how the proposed work will add substantial value to the technical validity and feasibility of the IRWMP, thereby improving the Plan and future projects. Additionally, the Work Plan is consistent with the Budget and Schedule, and is sufficiently detailed to be inserted as the scope of work in a grant agreement.
- **DAC Involvement** The Work Plan does not include any tasks that facilitate and support the involvement of DACs in the planning effort. The applicant does note that no DACs have been identified within the region to date and goes on to present a discussion on current outreach efforts to "pockets of low income areas." The Work Plan provides a discussion on the various strategies used to reach out to DACs, noting what these types of outreach are, and will continue as part of the planning process.
- **Schedule** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The Schedule is reasonable, specific and consistent with the Work Plan and Budget, with the proposed work scheduled for completion approximately two years after the assumed effective date.
- **Budget** The criterion is less than fully addressed and the documentation is insufficient. The requested grant amount exceeds the total amount eligible. The amount requested for task 4 (\$27,563) is not



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012*

---

included in the grand total on the Budget Summary Table. The use of staff names rather than classifications in budget estimates prevents reviewer evaluation of estimate reasonableness. The basis and justification of the consultants' lump sum fee estimates for tasks 1, 2, and 3 is not provided, nor is there any information about how the costs associated with tasks 1.1 and 1.2 were derived. Nine quarterly reports were included in task 4.1, where only eight are noted in the Schedule.

- **Program Preference** The applicant clearly shows that 11 of 15 Program and Statewide Preferences are either currently being met or will be met through this proposal.
  
- **Tie Breaker** Not Applicable.